

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANTHONY JONATHAN DOHRMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

PLACER COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE,
et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:25-cv-1934 CKD P

ORDER AND

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On July 15, 2025, plaintiff was ordered to file a completed in forma pauperis application or pay the filing fee within thirty days and was cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. The thirty-day period has now expired, and plaintiff has not responded to the court's order.

Although it appears from the file that plaintiff's copy of the July 15, 2025, order was returned, plaintiff was properly served. It is the plaintiff's responsibility to keep the court apprised of his current address at all times. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court assign a district court judge to this case; and

////

1 IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice. See
2 Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

3 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge
4 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days
5 after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections
6 with the court. Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may
7 waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir.
8 1991).

9 Dated: August 27, 2025



CAROLYN K. DELANEY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

14 1
15 dohr1934.fifp